

With regard to focus group location, the notice indicated that NHTSA intended to conduct two (2) focus groups in three (3) cities. NHTSA plans to conduct the focus groups in one city each in the Northeast, South or Midwest, and the West to achieve geographic diversity. NHTSA is particularly interested in comments regarding whether or not the western location should be in California.

In 2003, the California legislature adopted Assembly Bill No. 844 (AB 844), which required the California Energy Commission to develop a comprehensive fuel efficient tire program. In 2009, a draft regulation was made public which specified testing and reporting requirements for manufacturers, described the database of fuel efficiency of replacement tires sold in California, and defined a "fuel efficient tire." As a result of these regulations, if California is included, NHTSA wonders whether the results might differ from other locations because those consumers might be more exposed to the issues of fuel efficiency and tires than other consumers, which would offer potential insight into comprehension of tire information while possibly conveying consumer understanding that is unique to consumers that have been exposed to advanced information as compared to the general population. NHTSA seeks comments on whether focus groups results from California may not be generally applicable to a national population of replacement tire consumers. On the other hand, if the results were similar to other locations, that might indicate the difficulty in raising awareness of this type of information.

With regard to *RRC* vs. *RRF*,<sup>3</sup> in the March 30, 2010 final rule NHTSA stated that it was deferring the decision on which measurement metric was the appropriate metric to base the fuel efficiency rating upon (75 FR 15894, 15919). Previous comments received by the agency were split between those who supported basing a fuel efficiency rating on *RRF* because it directly relates to the amount of fuel consumed, and those who supported basing a fuel efficiency rating on *RRC* because ratings based on *RRF* would tend to cluster small tires around high ratings and

larger tires around low ratings. These commenters argued that basing a fuel efficiency rating on *RRC* would spread out ratings for tires available to a single consumer so that the consumer would be able to get a top-rated tire, and that denying consumers the ability to purchase a top-rated tire would discourage consumers. NHTSA believes that a rating based on *RRC* could only be used to compare tires of the same size and load rating. Therefore, from the standpoint of consumer perception, the agency's main concern is that if a consumer is looking at fuel efficiency ratings across a range of different-sized tires, e.g., if the consumer has one family vehicle that requires 18-inch replacement tires and another family vehicle that requires 15-inch replacement tires, fuel efficiency ratings based on *RRC* would not accurately reflect the contribution of a tire to fuel consumption since *RRCs* for larger tires (with greater test loads) can be lower than those of smaller tires, i.e., they would get a higher fuel efficiency rating than a small tire in a rating system based on *RRC*. To assist in a decision on this issue, NHTSA intends to explore how often consumers consider different size tires in their purchase decisions, and what the perceptual implications are if a consumer cannot find a top-rated tire among the replacement tire choices that are available for their vehicle. NHTSA requests comment on whether there is other information NHTSA could explore with regard to this issue.

Finally, NHTSA is requesting information on any labeling or other information that is currently voluntarily provided by tire manufacturers or tire retailers, on tires or otherwise. NHTSA intends to explore what information participants have seen, and how they recall, interpret, and apply it. This will assist the agency in evaluating how well the participants comprehend the information, which types of information are meaningful to their purchasing choices, and which information impacts their behavior.

Issued on: September 21, 2010.

**Rebecca Pennington,**

*Associate Administrator, Planning, Administrative and Financial Management.*

[FR Doc. 2010-24115 Filed 9-24-10; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 4910-59-P**

## DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

### Federal Aviation Administration

#### Agency Information Collection Activities: Requests for Comments; Clearance of Renewed Approval of Information Collection(s): Certification Procedures for Products and Parts

**AGENCY:** Federal Aviation Administration (FAA), DOT.

**ACTION:** Notice and request for comments.

**SUMMARY:** In accordance with the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, FAA invites public comments about our intention to request the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) approval to renew an information collection. The Federal Register Notice with a 60-day comment period soliciting comments on the following collection of information was published on June 25, 2010, vol. 75, no. 122, page 36464. 14 CFR part 21 prescribes certification standards for aircraft, aircraft engines, propellers appliances and parts. The information collected is used to determine compliance and applicant eligibility. The respondents are aircraft parts designers, manufacturers, and aircraft owners. Public burden for FAA form 8130-3 had previously been included with this information collection in error, and has been removed.

**DATES:** Written comments should be submitted by October 27, 2010.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Carla Scott on (202) 267-9895, or by e-mail at [Carla.Scott@faa.gov](mailto:Carla.Scott@faa.gov).

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:**

*OMB Control Number:* 2120-0018.

*Title:* Certification Procedures for Products and Parts.

*Form Numbers:* FAA Forms 8110-12, 8130-1, 8130-6, 8130-9, 8130-12.

*Type of Review:* Renewal of an information collection.

*Background:* 14 CFR part 21 prescribes certification standards for aircraft, aircraft engines, propellers appliances and parts. The information collected is used to determine compliance and applicant eligibility. FAA Airworthiness inspectors, designated inspectors, engineers, and designated engineers review the required data submittals to determine that aviation products and articles and their manufacturing facilities comply with the applicable requirements, and that the products and articles have no unsafe features.

*Respondents:* Approximately 13,339 aircraft parts designers, manufacturers, and aircraft owners.

<sup>3</sup> *RRF* is the rolling resistance force measurement measured by a rolling resistance test procedure. *RRC* is *RRF* divided by the test load of the tire, where most test procedures specify test load as a percentage of the maximum load rating of the tire being tested. In a June 2009 notice of proposed rulemaking, NHTSA proposed to base the fuel efficiency rating on the *RRF* metric because such a rating translates more directly to the fuel required to move a tire. See 74 FR 29542 (June 22, 2009).

*Frequency:* Information is collected on occasion.

*Estimated Average Burden per Response:* 17 minutes.

*Estimated Total Annual Burden:* 19,487 hours.

**ADDRESSES:** Interested persons are invited to submit written comments on the proposed information collection to the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs, Office of Management and Budget. Comments should be addressed to the attention of the Desk Officer, Department of Transportation/FAA, and sent via electronic mail to [oir\\_submission@omb.eop.gov](mailto:oir_submission@omb.eop.gov), or faxed to (202)395-6974, or mailed to the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs, Office of Management and Budget, Docket Library, Room 10102, 725 17th Street, NW., Washington, DC 20503.

*Public Comments Invited:* You are asked to comment on any aspect of this information collection, including (a) Whether the proposed collection of information is necessary for FAA's performance; (b) the accuracy of the estimated burden; (c) ways for FAA to enhance the quality, utility and clarity of the information collection; and (d) ways that the burden could be minimized without reducing the quality of the collected information. The agency will summarize and/or include your comments in the request for OMB's clearance of this information collection.

Issued in Washington, DC, on September 20, 2010.

**Carla Scott,**

*FAA Information Collection Clearance Officer, IT Enterprises Business Services Division, AES-200.*

[FR Doc. 2010-24106 Filed 9-24-10; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 4910-13-P**

## DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

### National Highway Traffic Safety Administration

[Docket No. NHTSA-2010-0086]

#### Reports, Forms, and Recordkeeping Requirements

**AGENCY:** National Highway Traffic Safety Administration (NHTSA), Department of Transportation (DOT).

**ACTION:** Request for public comment on proposed collection of information.

**SUMMARY:** This notice solicits public comment on continuation of the requirements for the collection of information on safety standards. Before a Federal agency can collect certain information from the public, it must receive approval from the Office of

Management and Budget (OMB). Under procedures established by the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, before seeking approval, Federal agencies must solicit public comment on proposed collections of information, including extensions and reinstatement of previously approved collections. This document describes a collection of information for an existing regulation for the aftermarket modifications of vehicles to accommodate people with disabilities for which NHTSA intends to seek renewed OMB approval.

**DATES:** Comments must be received on or before October 27, 2010.

**ADDRESSES:** Comments must refer to the docket notice number cited at the beginning of this notice, and the OMB control number, 2127-0635, and be submitted to the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs, Office of Management and Budget, *Attn:* Desk Officer for NHTSA, 725 17th Street, NW., Washington, DC 20503. It is requested, but not required, that 2 copies of the comment be provided.

Commenters may also, but are not required to, submit their comments to the docket number identified in the heading of this document by any of the following methods:

- *Federal eRulemaking Portal:* Go to <http://www.regulations.gov>. Follow the online instructions for submitting comments.
- *Mail:* Docket Management Facility, M-30, U.S. Department of Transportation, West Building, Ground Floor, Room W12-140, 1200 New Jersey Avenue, SE., Washington, DC 20590
- *Hand Delivery or Courier:* West Building Ground Floor, Room W12-140, 1200 New Jersey Avenue, SE., Washington, DC 20590, between 9 a.m. and 5 p.m. Eastern Time, Monday through Friday, except Federal holidays.
- *Fax:* (202) 493-2251.

You may call the Docket Management Facility at 202-366-9826.

Regardless of how you submit your comments, you should mention the docket number of this document.

#### FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Complete copies of each request for collection may be obtained from Mrs. Gayle Dalrymple, NVS-123, National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, 1200 New Jersey Ave., SE., Washington, DC 20590. Mrs. Dalrymple's telephone number is (202) 366-5559.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** On February 27, 2001 NHTSA published a final rule (66 FR 12638) to facilitate the modification of motor vehicles so that persons with disabilities can drive or ride in them as passengers. In that final rule, the agency issued a limited

exemption from a statutory provision that prohibits specified types of commercial entities from either removing safety equipment or features installed on motor vehicles pursuant to the Federal motor vehicle safety standards or altering the equipment or features so as to adversely affect their performance. The exemption is limited in that it allows repair businesses to modify only certain types of Federally-required safety equipment and features, under specified circumstances. The regulation is found at 49 CFR part 595 subpart C—Vehicle Modifications to Accommodate People with Disabilities.

This final rule included two new "collections of information," as that term is defined in 5 CFR part 1320 *Controlling Paperwork Burdens on the Public:* modifier identification and a document to be provided to the owner of the modified vehicle stating the exemptions used for that vehicle and any reduction in load carrying capacity of the vehicle of more than 100 kg (220 lbs).

Modifiers who take advantage of the exemption created by this rule are required to furnish NHTSA with a written document providing the modifier's name, address, and telephone number, and a statement that the modifier is availing itself of the exemption. The rule requires:

#### "S595.6 Modifier Identification

(a) Any motor vehicle repair business that modifies a motor vehicle to enable a person with a disability to operate, or ride as a passenger in, the motor vehicle and intends to avail itself of the exemption provided in 49 CFR 595.7 shall furnish the information specified in paragraphs (a)(1) through (3) of this section to: Administrator, National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, 400 Seventh Street, SW., Washington, DC 20590.

(1) Full individual, partnership, or corporate name of the motor vehicle repair business.

(2) Residence address of the motor vehicle repair business and State of incorporation if applicable.

(3) A statement that the motor vehicle repair business modifies a motor vehicle to enable a person with a disability to operate, or ride as a passenger in, the motor vehicle and intends to avail itself of the exemption provided in 49 CFR 595.7.

(b) Each motor vehicle repair business required to submit information under paragraph (a) of this section shall submit the information not later than August 27, 2001. After that date, each motor vehicle repair business that modifies a motor vehicle to enable a